

Wesley E. Smith III
465 North Nassau Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29403
(843)723-8598

June 9, 2015

RECEIVED

JUN 12 2015

CLERK

Honorable Daniel Shearouse
Supreme Court Building
1251 Gervais Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

S.C. SUPREME COURT

RE: Pepsi Bottling Group INC et al, Respondents v Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III Appellant
Court of Appeals Case No. 2015-000548

Honorable Clerk Daniel Shearouse:

Enclosed for your immediate action and in accordance with appellant rule 217. the appellant seeks rule to argue against the appeals court lower court written opinion of the Honorable R. Markley Dennis with precedent case of Goodson v. American Bankers Inc, Co (St C 1988) and the supporting case by this agency in McCall v. A-T-O 276 S.C. 143 (1981) in that the South Carolina Supreme Court has never held laymen to a lesser standard than attorney. Since the employment practice is not an issue how well both deponent do their jobs and I am not allowed to come into a place on employment to bestow my will upon the legal teams, then I demand the same treatment, as relied upon per the precedents, as parties are similarity situated. Order having not legal familiarity is an order having no legal familiarity regardless wh is before the court gates.

Those elected individuals, those delegated by the court and allowed to practice under the state needs strict supervision under acting under the mandated provision set forth by the South Carolina State laws regarding the issue under the same precedents. I maybe considered ignorant to the material facts based on the mistakes at law to most, but based on information and beleifs a laymen is somebody without specialist knowledge, especially a man, who is not trained or an expert in a specified area. A "practice" is not a specified area of expertise. With such practices allowed within the State, I have not relinquished my legal rights, authorized or waived precedents shied which grants such immunity from being attacked in any mannerism of things by nuisance and predators of law abiding citizen, selected to be a arbitrarily targeted, psychologically, physically and emotionally practice upon while a " practicing attorney or state prosecutor" may gain unwarranted points an aversive, unethical and unlawful business practice system (I still oppose of) which rewards such buffoonery of moot, frivolous and legally unfamiliar practices.

This practiced action, as allowed continues to be beyond reasonableness of intent on citizens right. This court should respectfully compel the lower court to supply all documents, as relied upon in the expressly written order. The decision was decided from the respondents paperwork,

as relied on in its termination process of an employee legal process, but mr. Wesley Edward Smith III was not present at trial to receive the paper .

Per the appellate court letter (as attached) its implied that the case is finally disposed related to 2013-CP-10-00417, but that is an error of law, for Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III is without a trial, is legally unfamiliar with the causes of action and the order is absent the element necessary and as required substantiated poof and supporting enforcement agency memorandum of law argument, while not in compliances with the attached precedents.

As being lead and guided due to a business that has been allowed to "practice" now in error of precedent under the aforementioned precedent, as the court demands, thus a demand is respectfully requested tha this improper action by the courts, be reversed, expunged and or stricken with amending complaint modification of the order under the longstanding precedents. Strict considerations pursuant the longstanding appellate rule 217. On the face of the order, it is complicated, therefore a motion pursuant rule 214 also call for in the Consolidation of the lower court matters. **As stated in relevant parts 214 CONSOLIDATION (Assuming Arguendo)** Where there is more than one appeal from the same order, judgment, decision or decree, or where the same question is involved in two or more appeals in different cases, the appellate court may, in its discretion, order the appeal to be consolidated.
Last amended by Order dated May 3, 2007.


Thanking You in advance,

Sincerely,


Mr. Wesley Edward Smith III

COPY TO: Mr. Ashley B. Able, III ESQ

Mr. Wesley E. Smith III
465 N. Nassau Street
Charleston, South Carolina 29403



CLERK
Honorable Daniel Shearouse
Supreme Court Building
1251 Gervais Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

